

SECRET

Executive Registry
77-1352

DDA 77-2803

17 May 1977

(also of 20 May)

MEMORANDUM FOR: Director of Central Intelligence

FROM: John F. Blake
Deputy Director for Administration

SUBJECT: CIA Details to the National Security Council

M 27 May 1977

1. Action Requested: None; for information only.

2. Background:

It is my understanding, although I may be in error on this, that you recently stated CIA employees should not be detailed to the National Security Council. This has been interpreted to mean that you believe requested employees by NSC should be transferred to them and their salaries should be paid by the NSC.

Never said
No

I have asked our Director of Personnel to prepare the attached memorandum to me which I now forward to you. It recites our history of some 15 years of detailing employees to the National Security Council.

25X1A

If this historical procedure does not meet with your approval, I will be happy to undertake discussions with appropriate NSC officers leading to a different type of arrangement.



John F. Blake

Attachment

Memo dtd 13 May 77 to DDA
fr D/Pers, same subj

Distribution:

Orig - DCI w/Orig Att
1 - DDCI w/cy of Att
1 - ER w/cy of Att

SECRET

13 MAY 1977

DD/A Register
77-076

ATTACHMENT

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director for Administration

FROM : F. W. M. Janney
Director of Personnel

SUBJECT : CIA Details to the National Security
Council

1. Action Requested: That you may wish to discuss with the Director past practices of detailing CIA professional and clerical employees to the National Security Council to ascertain whether we maintain the status quo.

2. Background: The Central Intelligence Agency and the National Security Council have had a rather informal arrangement in detailing CIA people to NSC. Requirements for clerical and/or secretarial support have been levied -- usually by telephone, sometimes by note -- from the Administrative Officer/NSC to either the Director of Personnel or his Executive Assistant. To the best of our recollection, this arrangement has been going on for 15 or more years. We are reimbursed for clerical/secretarial employees, and they are not charged against Agency ceiling. There has been a general understanding that professional Agency employees detailed to NSC are not reimbursable; that is, we pay their salaries, they are slotted against Agency positions, and they count against the Agency's personnel strength ceiling. The rationale has been that those officers assigned to staff roles at NSC, as well as to the White House Situation Room, are an extension in some way of our own activities. Over the years, this matter of details to other Government agencies has been a question raised by the Directors of Central Intelligence, and the matter was thoroughly reviewed by the Senate and House Select Committees. As far as we know, there has not been any criticism of our detailing people to the NSC. Attached at Tab A for instance is a memorandum signed by you to Mr. Colby in 1973 concerning details, paragraph 3 dealing with NSC.

E 2 IMPDET
C1 by 012752

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET~~

25X1A 3. Current Situation: At the present time Samuel [REDACTED] are on detail on a non-reimbursable basis to perform normal substantive staff officer roles at NSC. They are not counted against NSC strength or permanent positions.

25X1A [REDACTED] is expected to report to NSC on 23 May as a substantive staff officer to be slotted against an NSC permanent position, but we are not to be reimbursed. Thus, technically his situation differs from that of [REDACTED].

25X1A

In addition, we have nine secretarial/clerical employees detailed to NSC on a reimbursable basis.

25X1A

There are 10 of our officers assigned to the White House Situation Room on a non-reimbursable basis. In regard to this latter group, [REDACTED] yesterday that to the best of his knowledge officers on detail to the White House Situation Room from other agencies are also detailed on a non-reimbursable basis.

Attached at Tab B is a current listing of Agency employees assigned to NSC.

4. Recommendation: It is recommended that you review the NSC detail situation with Admiral Turner and advise us whether the existing arrangements are satisfactory or whether changes should be effected.

25X1A

[REDACTED]
F. W. M. Janney

Atts

~~SECRET~~

Approved For Release 2001/09/04 : CIA-RDP89-01114R000100120012-0



Approved For Release 2001/09/04 : CIA-RDP89-01114R000100120012-0

25X1A

Approved For Release 2001/09/04 : CIA-RDP89-01114R000100120012-0

Approved For Release 2001/09/04 : CIA-RDP89-01114R000100120012-0

Approved For Release 2001/09/04 : CIA-RDP89-01114R000100120012-0



Approved For Release 2001/09/04 : CIA-RDP89-01114R000100120012-0

25X1A

Approved For Release 2001/09/04 : CIA-RDP89-01114R000100120012-0

Approved For Release 2001/09/04 : CIA-RDP89-01114R000100120012-0

SENDER WILL CHECK CL/		CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM	
		CONFIDENTIAL SECRET	

OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP

TO	NAME AND ADDRESS	DATE	INITIALS
1	DD/Pers		
2	D/Pers	31 May 1977	J
3	Ex Asst		
4			
5			
6			

ACTION	DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY
APPROVAL	DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION
COMMENT	FILE	RETURN
CONCURRENCE	INFORMATION	SIGNATURE

Remarks:

Mr Janney-


It appears that somehow Mr Blake had a different interpretation than you did of Adm Turner's thoughts re: details to NSC.

Notwithstanding, our memo apparently took care of the problem and I gather Adm Turner does not require any changes in the manner we have been handling details to NSC for many years.

RDK

FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER

FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.	DATE

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		
TO: DDA		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	
REMARKS: D/Pasand Relieve this matter is now cleared up! 		
FROM: SA/per		
FORM NO.	BUILDING	EXTENSION

STATINTL